



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.

THE MARTYRDOM OF ST. JOHN.

ONE of the most startling of recent German discoveries in the region of theology has passed almost unnoticed outside the Fatherland—the fact, brought to light some years ago by Dr. C. de Boor,¹ that Papias, the Father above all others qualified to throw light on the intricate Johannine problem, used words implying that John the son of Zebedee did not die in Ephesus at all, but was martyred in Jerusalem: “Papias in his second book says that John the divine and James his brother were slain by the Jews.”²

Scientific theologians have, of course, noted Dr. de Boor's discovery, but, even in Germany, until the publication within the last few months of Zahn's *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Vol. II, no attempt has been made either to refute or substantiate the conclusion to which it apparently points; and in recent utterances on the Johannine problem the new Papias text is not even mentioned. Besides this discovery of Dr. de Boor's, new texts, throwing indirect light on the subject, have recently been published by M. Max Bonnet³ and Dr. Corsen. And there are other texts, not noticed since Tübingen days, or never noticed at all, which now acquire fresh importance. It is under these circumstances that the present review of the situation is attempted.

In the first place, it is generally admitted that de Boor's whole statement of the case does not leave much room for doubt as to textual authenticity. Among other things, he notices a reëcho of the above-quoted passage, which Tübingen research unearthed nearly forty years ago, in Georgius Hamartolus, “Ἰωάννης μαρτυρίον κατηξίωται” (*Tübinger Quartalschrift*, 1862, pp. 466 ff.)—a reëcho which, owing to the lateness of Georgius Hamartolus, and the existence of a variant reading,

¹ “Neue Fragmente des Papias, Hegesippus und Pierius in bisher unbekannten Excerpten aus der Kirchengeschichte des Philippus Sidetes,” *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. 2, pp. 165–84. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.)

² P. 170: “Παπίας ἐν τῇ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ λέγει ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ Θεολόγος καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνηρέθησαν.”

³ *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, Partis II, Vol. I, 1898.

was generally discredited; but which proves now to have been genuine after all. A loophole, however, is still left for attack by the fact that what we have may be taken, not as a direct quotation from Papias, but as a reference; and Zahn has now suggested that a reference of Papias to the martyrdom of John the Baptist may have been misapplied to the apostle. In support of this theory he points to several patristic passages which might, he thinks, occasion such a blunder (*e. g.*, "Joannem interinebant Christum demonstrantem," *Pseudo-Cypr. adv. Jud.*, 2). The possibility of such a blunder, in spite of its grossness, must, of course, be admitted; but its probability depends on two premises, which I shall try to show to be untenable, *viz.*, that this mention of the apostle's martyrdom is unique, and that the contrary evidence is convincing.

We now come to a second piece of evidence as to John the apostle's violent death—that given in the Syriac Martyrology, translated by W. Wright (*Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1866). Here we commence with the name of Stephen, and then we have, "John and James, the apostles, in Jerusalem. Peter and Paul in Rome." Ewald, the only authority, so far as I know, who has noticed and commented on this passage (since his days it seems to have been forgotten), was unaware of any corroborative evidence; and, regarding the statement as quite isolated, he endeavored to explain it away on the hypothesis of the list being one of witnesses in the wider sense, not necessarily martyrs. But the objections to this view are overwhelming. For, in the first place, if mere confessorship were implied, we should expect to find all the apostles named, whereas, very remarkably, in view of the "Acta Apocrypha" of the second and third centuries, we only find those above mentioned. In the second place, there is the emphatic position between the proto-martyr and the great Roman martyrs. In the third place, there is the descriptive title, "The names of our lords the confessors and victors, and their days on which they gained their crowns," "The names of our lords the confessors who were slain in the East." Thus Ewald's explanation proves quite inadequate; and, when this is realized, the value of the Martyrology becomes very great; for, though in its present complete form it may not be earlier than the fourth or fifth century, yet it must represent long preëxistent Syrian custom and tradition. In connection with which may be noted the fact that the Ebionite evangelist, probably a Palestinian, places John and James at the head of his apostolic list (see Hilgenfeld's *Evangelia extra Canonem recepta*, pp. 33, 35). And bearing in mind how strongly established was the belief in John the apostle's demise at Ephesus,

from the beginning of the third century onward, it seems impossible for the notion of his martyrdom at Jerusalem to have crept in at any late date. Additional value is given to the Martyrology by the statement of Heracleon (*circa* 180 A. D.): "For not all the saved have made confession with the voice and so departed, amongst whom were Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi" (*Texts and Studies*, Vol. I, 4, p. 102). Surely John, too, would have been mentioned as having died a natural death, if his name were available.

We now come to a third piece of evidence—that furnished in the New Testament itself. Christ is reported as saying to James and John: "Ye shall indeed drink of my cup." If this expression stood alone, as it does in Matthew, one might explain it away in a vague sense; but, when we find it supplemented, as it is in Mark, "And ye shall indeed be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with," bearing in mind the special significance of this metaphor in Luke 12:50, it seems difficult to avoid the inference that martyrdom in the most real sense is pointed to. Would the second evangelist have used such an expression unless the martyrdom had already taken place? Whether that be so or not, all the Fathers who refer to the passage acknowledge that martyrdom was actually intimated, but one after another they endeavor to escape from the difficulty by appealing to the legend that either at Ephesus or Rome (so variable was the legend) John was thrown into a caldron of boiling oil, and preserved unharmed. And this subterfuge is obviously inadequate; for Christ's words, taken in their natural sense, require John to be martyr in fact as well as intention, and to be baptized with the blood-baptism in the same sense as was James.

Presuming these three pieces of evidence to be valid—if the Apocalypse be taken as apostolic—it would seem, then, that John fell a victim, returning to Judea from Patmos in the midst of the frenzy of 69 A. D. One may notice that the author of the Apocalypse refers to his residence at Patmos in the past tense, as though no longer there at the moment of writing. As to the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse, however, there exists, of course, considerable doubt. The author only reckons himself among "prophets," speaking of the apostolic body rather from the outside (Rev. 22:9; 21:14). Illustrative of which it may be noticed that in one version of the pseudo-Johannine Apocalypse, based in great measure on our canonical book, the recipient of the revelation is distinguished from the apostle: "Hear, O John, I shall sit with the twelve apostles and the

four-and-twenty elders; and thou thyself shalt be an elder on account of thy blameless life" (Tichendorf's *Apocalypses Apocryphæ*, p. 93). If, indeed, in addition to an apostolic origin, we also accept the tradition, first found in the Docetic *Acta Johannis* (ed. Max Bonnet), that the exile to Patmos took place in Domitian's persecution, 95 A. D., then the evidence of the Apocalypse would tell against the idea of actual martyrdom. But, as is well known, critics are now generally of opinion that the internal evidence points to 69 A. D.; and the value of the Docetic tradition, such as it is, is quite neutralized by the fact, which seems to have escaped notice, that in other, probably more orthodox, *Acta Johannis*—of much the same date as the Docetic (*circa* 170 A. D.), and best represented at present in the Syriac *History of John*—the apostle's exile to Patmos is attributed, not to Domitian, but to Nero (W. Wright's *Apocryphal Acts*, Vol. II, p. 55). The complete vagueness that existed as to the date of the exile is further illustrated by a subscription to our fourth gospel, that John was in Patmos "under Trajan" (see Alford's Greek Testament, 3d ed., p. 834). In fine, it is only by combining the rather questionable idea of apostolic authorship with the exceedingly doubtful idea of later origin that the Apocalypse can be made evidentiary against the idea of John the apostle's martyrdom in Jerusalem.

But, reverting from this digression about the Apocalypse, we have thus three distinct and powerful pieces of evidence as to the apostle's martyrdom, viz., the statement of Papias, the ancient tradition of the Syrian church, and Mark's implication written just after the time when John's martyrdom took place, if take place it did; and it must be admitted that these authorities, taken together, are sufficiently weighty to warrant our tentatively assuming the fact of John's martyrdom *circa* 70 A. D., and examining the evidence of his later residence at Ephesus from that standpoint. It is, of course, with regard to the authorship of the fourth gospel that the question is so interesting and important.

To begin with, above and beyond the three pieces of positive evidence above given, there are admittedly certain grave difficulties in the way of the current hypothesis—difficulties surmountable by themselves, but which, considered in connection with these three pieces of evidence, acquire a cumulative importance. Would Paul's gloomy presentiments as to the Ephesian church ("I know that after my departure grievous wolves shall enter in," Acts 20:29, 30) have been published quite in this form if the publisher knew that John the

apostle was in Ephesus? Are the epistles to Timothy, presuming them to be in their present shape post-Pauline, compatible with knowledge that John was to arrive soon after Paul's departure? In these two cases our ignorance as to dates leaves any inference precarious, but in the following cases we seem to have a solid basis for argument. The author of the seven Ignatian epistles, addressing the Ephesians (*circa* 150 A. D.), cites only their connection with Paul as proof of their unity with the apostolic church (*Ad. Eph.*, XII). Is this easily reconcilable with the later and lengthier residence among them of another apostle? Would not this tone be still stranger if from the pen of the real Ignatius (107 or 116 A. D.), writing soon after John's death? Again, while tradition is unanimous as to the residence in Ephesus of some celebrated John, tradition is also unanimous as to that John's survival "till the days of Trajan" (98-117 A. D.); and even by taking the date of Trajan's accession as the *terminus ad quem*, and making John the apostle under twenty at the crucifixion (for such supposition of extreme youth, however, there seems to be no foundation except the idea of this late survival), one cannot avoid a figure considerably beyond the ordinary and natural term of life. Again, is the argumentative, expostulatory, yet semi-authoritative tone of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians (96 A. D.) compatible with the fact of an apostle of the first rank being then alive? And does not the same reasoning hold good with regard to the self-justificatory, laboriously critical tone of Luke's address to Theophilus?

Such, then, is the case for John the apostle's comparatively early death. It remains to examine the evidence which points in the opposite direction. Working back from Irenæus I shall endeavor to show that when that Father's testimony has been reduced to its proper level, the remainder of the external evidence as to John the apostle's late residence in Ephesus, and his direct authorship of the fourth gospel, crumbles away almost completely.

Irenæus states, of course, that Papias and Polycarp were disciples of John the apostle; and it is equally a commonplace that Eusebius brought forward grave reasons to suppose that, with regard to Papias, Irenæus had made a mistake (Eusebius, *H. E.*, III, 39). Over this well-trodden ground let us hasten. But three remarks must be made in passing:

1. Eusebius did not carry his argument to its obviously necessary conclusion, viz., that Irenæus was equally mistaken with regard to Polycarp. Every scrap of evidence forthcoming shows that Papias

and Polycarp were contemporaries and associates, so that if, as Eusebius suggests, it was some "John the elder," not John the apostle, to whom Papias was disciple, then the same conclusion is almost inevitable with regard to Polycarp. To this conclusion Eusebius did not press, for the very obvious reason that he had a powerful doctrinal motive for discrediting Papias, and none for discrediting Polycarp.

2. Eusebius' argument is commonly cited as though it depended entirely on his quotation from Papias, in which the name "John," after occurring in an apostolic list, is repeated with the distinctive title "elder." This argument by itself is indeed strong, for, by rejecting Eusebius' distinction between the two Johns, Papias is made to say in one and the same breath that he derived information from John directly, and also made diligent inquiry as to John's remarks from any stray-comers who had seen John! And further, Papias is made to represent himself at one and the same moment as the disciple of an apostle, and also as a painstaking gleaner, gleaning and sifting when Christ's words had become rare and precious. But what is much more significant is the fact that Eusebius, having the whole of Papias' writings before him, with their numerous citations from "John the elder," felt himself able to state most emphatically that Papias nowhere claimed to have anything more than second-hand information—whereas it would naturally seem that the overwhelming fact of having familiarly known such an apostle as John would have stamped itself on his writings unmistakably. Eusebius' distinction of the "elder" has often been disparaged as though only paralleled in a somewhat vague statement by Dionysius of Alexandria. But such objection is unreasonable. He was able to refer to the testimony of more than one previous writer as to the separate personality of "the elder." And one may compare *Apost. Const.*, VII, 46, "bishop of Ephesus, John, ordained by me, John;" also *Book of the Bee*, ed. Budge, p. 104: "John, and John his disciple."⁴

3. Irenæus considerably discredits himself by adding that, besides an apostle, Polycarp met *many* who had seen Christ. Such an idea is absolutely incredible in the case of a person born fifty-two years after the crucifixion.⁵ But what is of far more importance is the form in which Irenæus gives the following citation: "The elders who saw John

⁴ Dr. J. Rendel Harris, to whom I am indebted for this reference, points out that, though the *Book of the Bee* is late, it incorporates material that is very early.

⁵ 167 A. D. being the date usually given for Polycarp's martyrdom, and his age being eighty-six, he would seem to have been born 81 A. D.

remembered to have heard from him how the Lord used to teach and say, 'The days shall come when vines shall spring up, etc.' Papias, a hearer of John, bears testimony to these things in writing" (*Adv. Hær.*, V, 33). For it is fairly evident from such form of citation that Papias did not tell about the vines on direct apostolic authority, but said that he had it from the elders who had seen John; and this clearly implies that he had not seen the apostle himself.

But is it necessary to carry these inferences about Papias farther? We now have his direct evidence that John, like James, was "slain by the Jews;" and this being so, it is only by the highly unnatural hypothesis of martyrdom by Ephesian Jews—thus separating his case from that of James and ignoring the Syrian martyrology—that any room is left for Papias and the apostle to have come into contact.

More valuable than the evidence of Irenæus is that of his contemporary, Polycrates of Ephesus, for Irenæus had left Asia Minor in boyhood, and, as already seen, his recollections were not altogether reliable: "Philip, one of the twelve apostles, sleeps in Hierapolis, and his two aged virgin daughters. Another of his daughters, who lived in the Holy Spirit, sleeps in Ephesus. Moreover, John who rested on the bosom of our Lord, who was a priest bearing the *πέταλον*, and martyr and teacher, he also rests at Ephesus" (Eus., *H. E.*, III, 31). Polycrates' words, taken literally, seem to imply that the beloved disciple was not one of the Twelve, but belonged to the order of *διδάσκαλοι*. This distinction of the beloved disciple from John the apostle, strange as it must now appear, would be quite natural on the part of one who, while accepting the fourth gospel, was also acquainted with the evidence of Papias as to the apostle's martyrdom by the Jews. But perhaps this is pressing Polycrates' words unduly. He may have shared Irenæus' error, just as, by all appearances in this passage before us, he confounds the two Philips; and this view is somewhat supported by his use of the word "*μαρτύς*."

When we get behind Irenæus and Polycrates, the next authority that meets us is those orthodox *Acta Johannis* before mentioned, the source probably of the boiling-oil story, from which the Muratorian writer drew his famous description of the origin of the fourth gospel. That description, in the abbreviated form in which the Muratorian writer gives it, has only passed muster as credible owing to the obscurity of some of its phrases. When we give those phrases their proper significance—and this can be done by reconstructing the lost *Acta* at this point by means of the quotations given below, the first

and most important of which has strangely escaped notice—then the character of the description as purely fictitious and not at all traditional reveals itself plainly.⁶

“Cohortantibus condiscipulis,” as we now see, means that *John went to Ephesus not late in life, but soon after the ascension, and that he wrote at the exhortation of Peter and Paul who came there to visit him, and of Andrew who had accompanied him!* Understood in this connection, “*ut recognoscentibus cunctis Johannes cuncta describeret*” is obviously a mere inference from our fourth evangelist’s use of the first person plural (John 1 : 14 ; 21 : 24). What these *Acta*, with their notion of an apostolic congress at Ephesus, prove indisputably is this, that the author had a *tabula rasa* to write upon.

The Docetic *Acta Johannis*, referred to above (p. 732), contain nothing as to the origin of the fourth gospel, but it is interesting to notice, taking them in conjunction with the *Acta Andreae*, that the author, like the author of the orthodox *Acta Johannis*, brought John to Ephesus early in life. There is something noteworthy in this. If either of the hagiologists had brought John to Ephesus late in life,

⁶“And they wrote and sent word to John that he too should write. But the holy man did not wish to write. . . . Then Cephas arose and took Paul with him, and they came to Ephesus unto John. And for five days they were persuading him to compose a gospel, but he was not willing, saying, ‘When the Spirit of Holiness wills it I will write.’ And at night the apostles slumbered. And the Spirit of Holiness descended. And John took paper and wrote his gospel in one hour and gave it to Paul and Peter” (WRIGHT, *Aprocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, Vol. II, pp. 58, 59).

“Andrew with John tarried in the city of Ephesus. . . . And the Lord appeared to Andrew in a vision . . . and after relating the vision to John, etc.” (MAX BONNET, *Acta Andreae*, p. 15).

“John, being exhorted by his acquaintances and urged by the Spirit, wrote a spiritual [=inspired] gospel” (Clem. of Alexandria in EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, Vol. III, p. 14).

“John was compelled by almost all the bishops then in Asia and by legations of many churches to write concerning the Savior’s divinity . . . and ecclesiastical history relates that when he was pressed by the brethren to write, he replied that he would do so if they all supplicated God in a set fast ; which being done *saturatus revelatione*, he burst into that prologue ‘In the beginning,’ etc.” (JEROME’S Pref. to *Comment. on St. Matt.*).

John fasts three days and, falling into a divine rapture at the close, dictates the gospel to Prochorus (PROCHORUS, *Acta Johannis*).

“The fourth gospel is by John, one of the disciples. When his fellow-disciples and bishops exhorted him he said, ‘Fast with me three days, and let us relate to one another the revelation which we receive.’ In the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John should write all things in his own name with the corroboration of them all” (*Muratorian Fragment*).

subsequent to Paul's last visit, then one might imagine that amid all their mass of fiction there was some glimmer of genuine tradition. But no. Neither here nor anywhere else is there the slightest account of John's coming to Ephesus otherwise than as Paul's predecessor. And it is an impressive fact that so firmly did this notion of the apostle's early residence in Ephesus root itself that the author of the *Transitus Mariæ* reconciled it with the equally firm fact of the Virgin's decease in Jerusalem by suggesting that John forgot all about the charge he received at the cross (Tischendorf's *Apocalypses*, pp. 97, 115, 116, 122, 126)!

The next authority that presents itself is the corrupt ninth-century note cited by Westcott (*Canon*, p. 77), in which Papias is reported as stating that he wrote the gospel himself, John dictating "recte." But this passage can be cited no longer. Corsen has recently pointed out irrefutably its explanation by the following parallel in a Greek catena: "Ἰωάννης . . . ὡς παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ τε Ἐιρεναῖος καὶ Ἐυσέβιος καὶ ἄλλοι πιστοὶ κατὰ διαδοχὴν γεγονότες ἱστορικοί . . . ἐπηγόρευσε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῷ ἑαυτοῦ μαθητῇ Παπῖα." The scribe evidently drew his knowledge, not from Papias direct, but partly from Eusebius' statement about Papias writing down accounts received from "John the elder," and partly from a very late and palpably fictitious statement that Prochorus, disciple of John, wrote down the gospel, John dictating in an erect attitude (= "recte"). (See Corsen, *Monarchianische Prologe*, pp. 114-17.)

Together with this note of Dr. Westcott's we must also abandon the idea that Papias gave any description at all of the composition of the fourth gospel. If he or any other early writer of standing had done so, we should surely find traces in later writers; whereas all we get is, with one remarkable exception, parrot-like reiteration of the almost worthless authorities already mentioned. Writers of the third and fourth centuries seem to have been in nearly the same destitute condition as ourselves. The one exception is as to the place where the fourth gospel was written. In Ephraem (see Moesinger, p. 286), and other authorities who probably reproduced a very early tradition, it is stated that "John wrote at Antioch," just before leaving that place for Rome. The prevalence of such an idea suggests forcibly the absence of any clear evidence connecting the gospel with Ephesus.

Lastly, there are the references to authorship in the gospel itself; and although it is outside the scope of this article to touch on internal evidence, yet these references are too intimately connected with the external to be passed over altogether. If Papias and Polycarp knew

that John the apostle perished in Jerusalem *circa* 70 A. D., could they have accepted the fourth gospel? It seems to me that the generation next to Papias and Polycarp could have accepted it easily, believing that the apostle had written it at Antioch previous to 70 A. D. (see above), or, as some authorities, misunderstanding Rev. 1:2, state, during his exile in Patmos (see Alford's Greek Testament, 3d ed., I, 834; *Apost. Const.*, VIII, 16; Hippolytus, *De XII Apostolis*). Papias and Polycarp, however, must have known the real facts of the case, one would think, disciples as they were of "John the elder;" and if they accepted the fourth gospel, as their use of the first Johanne epistle gives reason to suppose that in some measure they did, then surely they must have accepted it, not as a forgery, but as a genuine, honest work of "John the elder." It is of great importance, then, to ascertain whether the author of the fourth gospel really claims to be John the apostle. I submit that the references to authorship do not at all prove such a claim.

With regard to the first of these references (John 19:35) it has been often noticed that the author seems rather to distinguish himself from the beloved disciple: "He that saw hath borne witness, and his witness is true, and he knoweth that he saith true." Besides the fact that the idea of a man bearing such witness to his own veracity is in itself unnatural, there is also a slight implication in the use of the past tense (*μεμαρτύρηκεν*) that the evangelist regarded the evidence of the lance wound as belonging to the past. Now, the author of the Revelation had spoken of Christ being pierced, strengthening his statement with *ναὶ ἀμήν*; and several times through the book he asseverates that his words are "true and faithful." He had also spoken of himself as having borne "witness to all those things which he saw." May we not thus explain, "he knoweth that he saith true"?

In the second of these references (John 21:24) it is said of the beloved disciple: "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ γράψας ταῦτα, καὶ οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς αὐτοῦ ἡ μαρτυρία ἐστίν." Here again one notices the suggestive use of the past tense. Might not *γράφας* be another reference to the Revelation? Seeing that that book had described Christ as the Eternal, the Logos, and the Lamb, and that these are leading ideas of the gospel, might not the evangelist, combining the evidence of the Revelation with his own recollections of the beloved disciple's words, speak of the latter as having written some of those things that are found in the gospel, and, through his representative, bearing witness concerning others? All the more might he do so if,

like those interpreters before mentioned, he understood Rev. 1:2 as referring to some writing of the apostle's other than the Revelation. Believing Christ's promise that the Spirit of Truth would teach all things and bring what was forgotten to the disciples' remembrance, "saturatus revelatione," he might feel himself empowered and commissioned to restore the apostle's missing testimony. If it is urged that even so there is still a *suggestio falsi* in *γράφας ταῦτα*, this is surely taken away by the next clause: "We know that his witness is true." For as the evangelist several times uses such a plural (John 3:11), and as *οἶδαμεν* is quite Johannine (*cf.* 1 John 5:18, 19, 20), there seems to be no good ground for transferring these words, as is usually done, to a group of attesting elders. It may be added that the laudatory mode of reference, five times repeated, "whom Jesus loved," while quite understandable in the mouth of John the elder, referring to the apostle, sounds thoroughly unnatural from the lips of the apostle himself.

There remains that most important, but, on all grounds, most perplexing passage, "If I will that he tarry till I come," together with the consequent misunderstanding "that that disciple should not die," commonly taken as implying that the beloved disciple attained some advanced age which gave rise to expectations not fulfilled. Is this inference at all necessary? Christ had promised, according to the synoptists, that "some of those standing here shall in no wise taste of death until they see the Son of Man coming;" and however inadequate be the explanation that some of those whom he addressed were to witness the downfall of Jerusalem, the same objection does not apply to the words of an evangelist writing a couple of decades or so after the events of 70 A. D. Taken thus, *ἕως ἔρχομαι* would simply imply that John, perhaps alone of the apostles, would survive till the siege of Jerusalem; and it is probable that the expression would be specially related to, and corrective or explanatory of, his ardent expectation expressed so emphatically at the close of the Revelation: "He that spake these things said, 'Surely I come quickly.' Even so come." The fact that the second advent is kept out of sight in the fourth gospel, apparently by design, or rather is replaced by the idea of a continuously repeated advent (John 14:3, 18, 19, 23, 28), strengthens such an interpretation of *ἕως ἔρχομαι*. And the fact that in John 21:19, 20, when Peter is told to follow, the beloved disciple follows too, points rather to some interval between than to an essential difference in their fates.

One thing, at any rate, is clearly unsatisfactory, and that is to combine, as is usually done, this fall-of-Jerusalem interpretation of *ἕως*

ἐρχομαι with the longevity interpretation. This would force us to understand Christ's words as equivalent to "Until I come, and thirty years afterward." And further, we should be obliged to suppose that, long after the ἔως ἐρχομαι was fulfilled, John was still doubtful as to its meaning. No! If the fall-of-Jerusalem interpretation be adopted, then it most naturally follows that John did not survive that catastrophe (*cf.* Matt. 22 : 6).

There remains the alternative of some less personal and wider spiritual suggestion in this idea of the beloved disciple tarrying (*cf.* 1 John 2 : 17, "He who doeth the will of God tarrieth forever"). But to go farther into the several possible explanations of ἔως ἐρχομαι would lead too far afield. The object of this article was, in the light of recent publications, simply to review the external evidence for and against the idea of John the apostle's death in Ephesus *circa* 100 A. D. On the one side we have little more than the belief of Irenæus, who, owing to homonymy, may easily have been mistaken (just as Hegesippus, Polycrates, etc., were in similar cases), and the statements in *Acta Johannis*, which are in a high degree fictitious. On the other side we have early historical evidence, which it is most difficult or impossible to set aside or explain away.

F. P. BADHAM.

LONDON, E. C.,
England.

THE BEARING OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE PSALTER ON THE DATE OF THE FORTY-FOURTH PSALM.

THE church fathers of the school of Antioch—Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, and Theodoret—held that this psalm was spoken prophetically of the age of the Maccabees. In this opinion Calvin concurred. Many recent interpreters have held that it is one of the few, the internal evidence of which makes a Maccabæan origin practically certain. Such is the opinion of von Lengerke, Hitzig, Hupfeld, Nowack, Perowne, Driver, Cornill, Cheyne, Baethgen, Wellhausen, and Kautzsch—a formidable list. W. R. Smith in the first edition of his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church* inclined to this view,¹ but in the second edition he recedes from it, holding that it was composed in the time of Artaxerxes Ochus and the persecution of Bagoses.² Some eminent names may be cited as authorities for other dates, thus: de Wette assigned it to the reign of Jehoiakim; Kösters and Ewald to the sad

¹ *Cf.* pp. 196, 197.

² *Cf. ibid.*, pp. 207, 208.